

JS-6

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11

12 ALISON HELEN FAIRCHILD,
13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 BRIAN CHESKY, et al.,
16 Defendants.

Case No. CV 25-1747 JGB (PVC)

**ORDER SUMMARILY DISMISSING
ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

17
18
19 On October 30, 2019, the Court declared Arogant Hollywood and Alison Helen
20 Fairchild to be vexatious litigants and ORDERED:

21
22 [A]ny pleading submitted by Plaintiffs, or either of them, for the purpose of
23 initiating a new civil action in this District is presumptively barred from
24 filing unless: (1) Plaintiffs concurrently submit with such pleading both a
25 copy of this Order and a motion seeking leave to commence a new civil
26 action; and (2) a District Judge or Magistrate Judge of this Court thereafter
27 grants such leave and directs that the pleading be filed and the new civil
28 case be initiated.

1 *Hollywood and Fairchild v. Carrows California Family Restaurants et al.*, No. 2:18 CV
2 2098 JGB (GLS) (the “Order,” Dkt. No. 82).

3
4 In September 2024, without complying with the Order, Fairchild filed a civil rights
5 complaint in the Northern District of California against multiple defendants concerning
6 incidents related to a short-term property rental in Riverside. *Fairchild v. Han et al.*, No.
7 3:24 cv 6877 (N.D. Cal. filed Sept. 30, 2024); (*see also* Dkt. No. 1). On February 28,
8 2025, the case was transferred to this Court. (Dkt. Nos. 33, 34). In so doing, the Northern
9 District found it “clear that relevant witnesses and information related to this case are all
10 located in the Los Angeles and Riverside area.” (Dkt. No. 33 at 4) (citation omitted).
11 Moreover, the only Defendant who has appeared in this matter resides in the Central
12 District. (Dkt. No. 13). Accordingly, the Northern District concluded that Plaintiff has
13 engaged in impermissible forum shopping to avoid this Court’s Order. (Dkt. No. 33 at 3–
14 4).

15
16 Plaintiff cannot attempt to circumvent the Order and flaunt threshold venue
17 requirements by initiating claims that arise in this District in neighboring districts. *See*,
18 *e.g.*, *Greene v. Alhambra Hosp. Med. Ctr.*, No. 215CV00451JADNJK, 2016 WL
19 3176596, at *1 (D. Nev. May 17, 2016) (finding that the vexatious litigant has
20 impermissibly “attempted to circumvent that vexatious litigant finding by initiating his
21 cases in two other neighboring districts”) (collecting cases), *report and recommendation*
22 *adopted*, No. 215CV00451JADNJK, 2016 WL 3148389 (D. Nev. June 2, 2016); *see also*
23 *id.* at *5 (“[The vexatious litigant] has long been aware that he cannot circumvent the
24 vexatious litigant order in the Central District of California by simply bringing claims that
25 arise in that forum in other district courts.”). Indeed, Courts routinely reject such
26 attempts. *See, e.g.*, *Johnson v. Commonwealth Hosp. LLC*, No. 224CV00590RFBNJK,
27 2024 WL 1554239, at *1 n.2 (D. Nev. Apr. 10, 2024) (“Quite plainly, a plaintiff is not
28 permitted to bring suit in a distant district as a means to avoid a vexatious litigant order.”);

1 *Magee v. Clark*, No. CV 09-5784-ABC (RC), 2009 WL 2488040, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Aug.
2 11, 2009) (“Since being declared a vexatious litigant in this district court, petitioner has
3 filed at least three habeas corpus petitions in other district courts challenging his 1965
4 conviction and sentence in Los Angeles County Superior Court case no. 272227, in a
5 blatant attempt to avoid the Order of this Court declaring him a vexatious litigant and
6 requiring approval of any habeas filing by petitioner.”).

7
8 Here, for the convenience of the parties, convenience of the witnesses, ease of
9 access to the evidence, and local interest in the controversy, venue is clearly appropriate
10 only in the Central District. Therefore, the Court concludes that Plaintiff filed her
11 Complaint in the Northern District to deliberately flout the Vexatious Litigant Order.
12 Accordingly, this action is summarily DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15
16
17
18
19 DATED: March 13, 2025


JESUS C. BERNAL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

20
21
22 Presented by:

23
24 

25
26 PEDRO V. CASTILLO
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27
28